



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,337	08/03/2001	John Blair	KM2158.001CP1	8212
20995 7590 01/07/2010 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER				
WINTER, JOHN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3685				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/07/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/922,337

Applicant(s)

BLAIR ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN M. WINTER

Art Unit

3685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 11, 36, 41, 42, 44, 45, 47-49, 56, 57 and 59-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 11, 36 and 41, 42, 44, 45, 47-49, 56, 57 and 59-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. The Applicants amendment filed on August 28, 2009 is hereby acknowledged, Claims 10, 11, 36 and 41, 42, 44, 45, 47-49, 56, 57 and 59-65 remain pending

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Applicant states that Claim 10 recites receiving indications of a requested format of one or more content data objects. Beattie instead describes receiving a search query that is later used to search a database, and thus does not teach or suggest "receiving indications from the client device of a requested format of one or more of the indicated content data objects," as recited by Claim 10.

The Examiner submits that the claim language "receiving indications" is not the same as actually receiving a request, receiving an indication might merely signal a future intent and does not necessarily include request data, the Examiner submits that the process of submitting a query as disclosed by Beattie is analogous to the claimed feature. Similarly information regarding the "requested format" is never communicated to the server, merely "indicated".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 10, 11, 36 and 41-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
4. Claims 10, 11, 36 and 41-62 are rejected based on Supreme Court precedent (See also *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a §101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. In addition, the tie to a particular apparatus, for example, cannot be mere extra-solution activity. See *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps.

To meet prong (1), the method step should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied. This may be accomplished by having the claim positively recite the machine that accomplishes the method steps. Alternatively or to meet prong (2), the method step should positively recite identifying the material that is being changed to a different state or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed.

5. In this particular case, claim 10 fails prong (1) because the “tie” (e.g. client device and storage device) is representative of extra-solution activity. Additionally, the claim(s)

fail prong (2) because the method steps do not transform the underlying subject matter to a different state or thing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 10, 11, 36 and 41, 42, 44, 45, 47-49, 56, 57 and 59-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole, Jr. et al. (US Patent 6,279,112) in view of Heindel et al. (US Patent 6,304,857) and further in view of Beattie et al. (US Patent 5,659,742).

7. As per claims 10, 36, 56 and 63

O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) discloses a computerized method for transmitting content data over a network of devices, the method configured for execution by at least one computing device, the method comprising:

receiving content data objects from each of a plurality of publishers; (Column 5, lines 23-45) storing received content data objects in a computer readable storage device

receiving from a client device indications of selection of two or more of the content data objects; receiving indications from the client device of payment terms and conditions for transmission of the indicated content data objects; (Figure 4A, 4B)

O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) does not explicitly disclose initiating transfer of respective portions of a payment from a payment account associated with the client device to each of the publishers of the indicated content data objects. Heindel et al. ('857), discloses initiating transfer of respective portions of a payment from a payment account associated with the client device to each of the publishers of the indicated content data objects, (Column 8, lines 10-39); it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the O'toole, Jr. et al. with the Heindel et al. ('857) method in order to allow the merchant to offload the cost of processing billing transactions.

O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) does not explicitly disclose receiving indications from the client device of a requested format of one or more of the indicated content data objects; storing received indications in a computer readable storage device; transforming the one or more of the indicated content data objects from respective native formats as provided by the respective publishers to the requested format; storing the transformed content data objects in a computer readable storage_ device and aggregating at least some of the transformed content data objects. Beattie et al ('742), discloses receiving indications from the client device of a requested format of one or more of the indicated content data objects; storing received indications in a computer readable storage device; (Column 8, line 60 – column 9 line 8) transforming the one or more of the indicated content data objects from respective native formats as provided by the respective publishers to the requested format; storing the transformed content data objects in a computer readable storage_ device and aggregating at least some of the transformed content data objects

(Column 27, line 45- column 28 line 11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the O'Toole, Jr. et al. with Beattie et al ('742) method in order to allow storage of media in a standardized format.

8. As per claims 41, 47 and 59,

O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) discloses the method of claim 10

O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) does not explicitly disclose transforming one or more of the indicated content data objects from respective native formats to the requested format according to a type of client device accessing the content data objects that were selected. Beattie et al ('742), discloses transforming one or more of the indicated content data objects from respective native formats to the requested format according to a type of client device accessing the content data objects that were selected.(Column 27, line 45- column 28 line 11); it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the O'Toole, Jr. et al. with Beattie et al ('742) method in order to allow storage of media in a standardized format.

9. As per claims 11, 42, 48, 57, 60,62 and 64-65,

O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) discloses the method of claim 10

O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) does not explicitly disclose wherein the step of causing said initiating transfer includes determining the portion of the payment due to the respective publisher depending upon a type of the indicated content data objects that were contributed by the publisher. Heindel et al. ('857), discloses wherein the step of causing

said initiating transfer includes determining the portion of the payment due to the respective publisher depending upon a type of the indicated content data objects that were contributed by the publisher (Column 8, lines 10-39); it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the O'toole, Jr. et al. with the Heindel et al. ('857) method in order to allow the merchant to offload the cost of processing billing transactions.

10. As per claims 44, 49 and 61,
O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) discloses the method of claim 10
wherein the content data objects comprise at least one of: digital text data, digital audio data, digital video data, and computer program data. Column 4, lines 51-67)

11. As per claims 45,
O'Toole, Jr. et al. ('112) discloses the method of claim 10
wherein the content data objects comprise automatically generated content data objects from an embedded computing device. (Column 6, lines 32-36)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN M. WINTER whose telephone number is (571)272-6713. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6, 1st Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin Hewitt can be reached on (571) 272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMW

/ANDREW J. FISCHER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621